



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,402	09/28/2006	Alon Cohen	1582/8	6585
44596 7590 01/30/2012 DR. MARK M. FRIEDMAN Moshe Aviv Tower, 54th Floor, 7 Jabotinsky St. Ramat Gan, 52520 ISRAEL				
EXAMINER JOO, JOSHUA				
ART UNIT 2445		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 01/30/2012		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@friedpat.com  
friedpat.uspto@gmail.com  
nomi\_m@friedpat.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/599,402

**Applicant(s)**

COHEN, ALON

**Examiner**

JOSHUA JOO

**Art Unit**

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21-48 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-CB01)  
Paper No(s) Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s) Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

***Detailed Action***

This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed on December 06, 2011.

Claims 21-48 are pending in the application.

**Response to Arguments/Remarks**

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

Rejection of claims 22-27, 43-47, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 4th paragraph set in the Office action dated August 18, 2011 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Rejection of claims 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph set in the Office action dated August 18, 2011 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment.

Rejection of claims 21-27, 32, 34, 39, 41 and 43-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment. Regarding claim 39, Applicant remarked that "Claim 39 has been amended to correct the typographical error regarding the step of "fulfilling" and correctly reference the step in claim 35 of "installing a data-access engine", which is consistent with claims 25, 32, and 46". Examiner respectfully disagrees that the amended claim 39 is consistent with claims 25, 32, and 46. Claims 25, 32, and 46 disclose that the data-access engine is configured to fulfill data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault. Claims 25, 32, and 46 do not disclose any step of installing the data-access engine upon restrictions set by a network vault. The amended claim 39 does not appear to be supported by Applicant's specification. Examiner requests that Applicant specifically point out support for installing the data-engine dependent upon restrictions set by a network vault. MPEP 2163.06

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 21-48 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) Regarding claims 21, 28, 35, and 42, "the functionality" should be changed to "a functionality".

Appropriate correction is required.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation of "said step of installing a data-access engine is further dependent upon restrictions set by a network vault" does not appear to be supported by Applicant's specification. The specification discloses that operation such as retrieval of data by the data access engine is restricted by a network vault and implementing network vaults within data access engine. However, the specification does not disclose that installing of the data access engine is dependent upon restricted by a network vault.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22-23, 26-27, 29-30, 33-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a) Regarding claims 22, 26, and 27, it is unclear as to which client-side data-process machine "said client-side data-processing machine" is referring to as claim 21 recites "a client-side data-process machine" more than once.
- b) Regarding claim 27, "said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Firstly, claim 21 recites "at least one pseudo server" and not "servers". Secondly, claim 21 recites "said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface..." but does not provide basis for a user interface for each pseudo server.
- c) Regarding claim 27, it is unclear as to which client memory of said client-side data-processing machine "said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine" as claim 21 recites "a client memory of said client-side data-processing machine" more than once.
- d) Regarding claims 29 and 33, it is unclear as to which client-side data-process machine "said client-side data-processing machine" is referring to as claim 28 recites "a client-side data-process machine" more than once.
- e) Regarding claim 34, "said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 28 recites "said at least one pseudo server having a user interface..." but does not provide basis for a user interface for each pseudo server.
- f) Regarding claim 35, "said client-side data-processing machine" has insufficient antecedent basis.
- g) Regarding claims 36 and 40, it is unclear as to which client-side data-process machine "said client-side data-processing machine" is referring to as claim 35 recites "said client-side data processing machine" and "a client-side data-process machine" more than once.
- h) Regarding claim 41, "said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo server" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 35 recites "said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface..." but does not provide basis for a user interface for each pseudo server.
- i) Regarding claim 41, it is unclear as to which client memory of said client-side data-processing machine "said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine" as claim 35 recites "a client memory of said client-side data-processing machine" more than once.

- j) Regarding claim 42, the claim recites the limitations “a first set of at least one communications protocols” and “a second set of at least one communications protocols”. The limitations recite a “set” and “protocols” but also recites “at least one”. Therefore, the claim is unclear as to whether each of the first set and second set require a single protocol because of the term “one” or more than one protocol because of “protocols”.
- k) Regarding claims 43 and 47, it is unclear as to which client-side data-process machine “said client-side data-processing machine” is referring to as claim 42 recites “a client-side data-process machine” more than once.
- l) Regarding claim 48, “said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers” lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Claim 42 recites “at least one pseudo server” and not “servers”. Claim 42 recites “said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface...” but does not provide basis for a user interface for each pseudo server.
- m) Regarding claim 48, it is unclear as to which client memory of said client-side data-processing machine “said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine” as claim 42 recites “a client memory of said client-side data-processing machine” more than once.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-22, 26-29, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, US Publication No. 2001/0042171 (Vermeulen), in view of Mowat, US Patent No. 7,761,594 (Mowat hereinafter).

As per claim 21, Vermeulen teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a system for securely and efficiently fulfilling network requests, the system comprising:

(a) a server-side data-processing machine including a data-access engine, residing in a server memory of server-side data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0024-0025. Server to load and transfer file.), and;

(b) at least one pseudo server residing in a secondary memory of a secondary data-processing machine separate from said server-side data processing machine (Paragraph 0022. Proxy server connected to computer network. Paragraph 0026. Program code on memory in proxy server.),

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for fulfilling data requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.),

wherein the data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0023. Proxy server is a buffer between client and Internet. Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Request with address of file sent to proxy server. Proxy server sends "send file" request to receive file from server.),

wherein the functionality of said data access engine related to said data request from said client-side data-processing machine is confined to data storage and retrieval (Paragraph 0024-0025. Server dedicated to storing files for loading. Remote server transfers file to proxy server.).

Vermeulen does not specifically teach wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine.

Mowat teaches a pseudo server that includes a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for pseudo server of Vermeulen to include a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One

of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of providing an interface to enable simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. KSR, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1395; Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273, 282, 189 USPQ 449, 453 (1976); Anderson v. Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57, 62-63, 163 USPQ 673, 675 (1969); Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equipment Corp., 340 U.S. 147, 152, 87 USPQ 303, 306 (1950).

As per claim 28, Vermeulen teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a network system for securely and efficiently fulfilling network requests, the system comprising:

(a) a server-side data-processing machine having a data-access engine residing in a server memory for communicating with at least one pseudo server residing in a secondary memory of a secondary data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0024-0025. Server to load and transfer file to proxy server. Paragraph 0022. Proxy server connected to computer network.), and:

(b) said at least one pseudo server separate from said server-side data processing machine (Paragraph 0022. Proxy server connected to computer network. Paragraph 0026. Program code on memory in proxy server.), said at least one pseudo server having a server-logic module for fulfilling data requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.), wherein the data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0023. Proxy server is a buffer between client and Internet. Paragraphs



0022, 0024. Request with address of file sent to proxy server. Proxy server sends "send file" request to receive file from server.),

wherein the functionality of said data access engine related to said data request from said client-side data-processing machine is confined to data storage and retrieval (Paragraph 0024-0025. Server dedicated to storing files for loading. Remote server transfers file to proxy server.).

Vermeulen does not specifically teach wherein said at least one pseudo server having a user interface (UI) for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine.

Mowat teaches a pseudo server having a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for pseudo server of Vermeulen to include a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of providing an interface to enable simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. KSR, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1395; Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273, 282, 189 USPQ 449, 453 (1976); Anderson v. Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57, 62-63, 163 USPQ 673, 675 (1969); Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equipment Corp., 340 U.S. 147, 152, 87 USPQ 303, 306 (1950).

As per claim 22, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the system of claim 21. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network and at least one of said at least one pseudo one server is located in a second network having said client-side data-processing machine (Fig. 1; Paragraphs 0022-0023. Proxy server connected Intranet. Remote server connected to Internet.).

As per claim 26, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the system of claim 21. Vermeulen teaches wherein a local data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in one of said at least one pseudo server can be fulfilled directly by said one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0022, 0024. Proxy server determines file is in cache and transfer file.).

As per claim 27, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the system of claim 21. Vermeulen teaches wherein said server-logic module is for fulfilling logic requests (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers further are for user interface requests originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine.

Mowat teaches a pseudo server having a UI for fulfilling user interface requests originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include in the pseudo server of Vermeulen a UI for fulfilling user interface requests originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of enabling simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known

methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 29, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the network system of claim 28. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network and at least one of said at least one pseudo one server is located in a second network having said client-side data-processing machine (Fig. 1; Paragraphs 0022-0023. Proxy server connected Intranet. Remote server connected to Internet.).

As per claim 33, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the network system of claim 28. Vermeulen teaches wherein one of said at least one pseudo server is configured to directly fulfill a local data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in one of said one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0022, 0024. Proxy server determines file is in cache and transfer file.).

As per claim 34, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the network system of claim 28. Vermeulen teaches wherein said server-logic module is configured to fulfill logic requests (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers further configured to fulfill a user interface request originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine.

Mowat teaches a pseudo server having a UI for fulfilling a user interface request originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include in the pseudo server of Vermeulen a UI for fulfilling a user interface request originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would

have similarly provided the benefit of enabling simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. It would have been obvious to also combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of Mowat and Benayoun et al. US Publication No. 2001/0056476 (Benayoun hereinafter).

As per claim 23, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the system of claim 22. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate with other client-side data-processing machines via a pseudo server residing (Paragraph 0023. Clients connected to proxy server.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach communicating via pseudo servers within said first network.

Benayoun teaches communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers within said first network (Fig. 2; Paragraph 0064).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers within a first network as disclosed by Benayoun. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Benayoun would have provided the benefit of load sharing and robustness.

As per claim 30, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the network system of claim 29. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate with other client-side data-processing machines via a pseudo server (Paragraph 0023. Clients connected to proxy server.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach communicating via pseudo servers within said first network.

Benayoun teaches communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers residing within said first network (Fig. 2; Paragraph 0064).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers residing within a first network as disclosed by Benayoun. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Benayoun would have provided the benefit of load sharing and robustness.

Claims 24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of Mowat and Zellers et al. US Publication No. 2003/0154244 (Zellers hereinafter).

As per claim 24, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the system of claim 21, wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server.

Zellers teaches a system comprising a data access engine and at least one pseudo server wherein the data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server (Figs. 2-3; Paragraphs 0039, 0043).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include a content-filtering device and for the data-access engine to be configured to communicate via the content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server as disclosed by Zellers. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have provided the benefit of increased network security by controlling connections between networks.

As per claim 31, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the network system of claim 28, wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server.

Zellers teaches a system comprising a data access engine and at least one pseudo server wherein the data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server (Figs. 2-3; Paragraphs 0039, 0043).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include a content-filtering device and for the data-access engine to be configured to communicate via the content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server as disclosed by Zellers. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have provided the benefit of increased network security by controlling connections between networks.

Claims 25 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of Mowat and Cohen, US Patent No. 6,356,941 (Cohen hereinafter).

As per claim 25, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the system of claim 21, wherein said data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault.

Cohen teaches a data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault (col. 13, lines 42-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the data-access engine to be configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault as disclosed by Cohen. One of skill in the art would have

been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have increased security by providing secure storage and transfer of data.

As per claim 32, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the network system of claim 28, wherein said data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault.

Cohen teaches a data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault (col. 13, lines 42-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the data-access engine to be configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault as disclosed by Cohen. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have increased security by providing secure storage and transfer of data.

Claims 35-36, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of Mowat and Kramer et al. US Publication No. 2002/0099957 (Kramer hereinafter).

As per claim 35, Vermeulen teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for securely and efficiently fulfilling network requests, the method comprising:

(a) installing a data-access engine residing in a server memory of a server-side data-processing machine for communicating with at least one pseudo server residing in a secondary memory of a secondary data-processing machine separate from said server-side data processing machine (Paragraphs 0024-0025. Server to load and transfer file to proxy server. Paragraph 0022. Proxy server connected to computer network. Paragraph 0022. Proxy server connected to computer network. Paragraph 0026. Program code on memory in proxy server.),

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for fulfilling data requests originating from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said data-access engine originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.),

wherein the functionality of said data access engine related to said data request from said client-side data-processing machine is confined to data storage and retrieval (Paragraph 0024-0025. Server dedicated to storing files for loading. Remote server transfers file to proxy server.).

Vermeulen does not specifically teach wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine; and denying by said data-access engine network requests, unless the network requests are said data requests that have been routed through one of said at least one pseudo server.

Mowat teaches of a pseudo server having a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the pseudo server of Vermeulen to include a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of enabling simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. KSR, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1395; Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273, 282, 189 USPQ 449, 453 (1976); Anderson 's-Black Rock,



Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57, 62-63, 163 USPQ 673, 675 (1969); Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equipment Corp., 340 U.S. 147, 152, 87 USPQ 303, 306 (1950).

Kramer teaches of denying network requests unless network requests are said data requests that have been routed through least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0041).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the data access engine of Vermeulen to include a function to deny network requests unless the network requests are said data requests that have been routed through at least one pseudo server as disclosed by Kramer. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Kramer would have provided the benefit of network security by denying requests that do not comply to an operating procedure of the network. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As per claim 36, Vermeulen, Mowat, and Kramer teach the method of claim 35. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network and at least one of said at least one pseudo one server is located in a second network having said client-side data-processing machine (Fig. 1; Paragraphs 0022-0023. Proxy server connected Intranet. Remote server connected to Internet.).

As per claim 40, Vermeulen, Mowat, and Kramer teach the method of claim 35. Vermeulen teaches the method further comprising the steps of : directly fulfilling, by one of said at least one pseudo server, a local data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in one of said

one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0022, 0024. Proxy server determines file is in cache and transfer file.).

As per claim 41, Vermeulen, Mowat, and Kramer teach the method of claim 35. Vermeulen teaches the method further comprising the steps of: directly fulfilling, by said server-logic module, a logic request (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach directly fulfilling by said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers a user interface request originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine.

Mowat teaches a pseudo server having a UI for directly fulfilling a user interface request originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include in the pseudo server of Vermeulen a UI for directly fulfilling a user interface request originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of enabling simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of Mowat, Kramer, and Benayoun.

As per claim 37, Vermeulen, Mowat, and Kramer teach the method of claim 36. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate with other client-side data-

processing machines via a pseudo server residing within said first network (Paragraph 0023. Clients connected to proxy server.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach communicating via pseudo servers residing within said first network.

Benayoun teaches communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers residing within said first network (Fig. 2; Paragraph 0064).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers residing within said first network as disclosed by Benayoun. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Benayoun would have provided the benefit of load sharing and robustness.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of Mowat, Kramer, and Zellers.

As per claim 38, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the method of claim 35, wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server.

Zellers teaches a system comprising a data access engine and at least one pseudo server wherein the data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server (Figs. 2-3; Paragraphs 0039, 0043).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include a content-filtering device and for the data-access engine to be configured to communicate via the content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server as disclosed by Zellers. One of skill in the art would have been motivated

to combine the teachings as Zeller would have provided the benefit of increased network security by controlling connections between networks.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of in view of Mowat, Kramer, and Cohen.

As per claim 39, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the system of claim 21, wherein said step of installing a data-access engine is further dependent upon restrictions set by a network vault.

Cohen teaches installing a data-access engine further dependent upon restrictions set by a network vault (col. 13, lines 42-51. Installed software operates upon restrictions.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the step of installing data-access engine to be further dependent upon restrictions set by a network vault as disclosed by Cohen. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have increased security by providing secure storage and transfer of data.

Claims 42-43, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of O' Laughlen et al. US Publication No. 2005/0015442 (O' Laughlen hereinafter) and Mowat.

As per claim 42, Vermeulen teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a system for securely and efficiently fulfilling network requests, the system comprising:

(a) a server-side data-processing machine including a data-access engine, residing in a server memory of server-side data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0024-0025. Server to load and transfer file.), and:

(b) at least one pseudo server residing in a secondary memory of a secondary data-processing machine different from said server-side data processing machine (Paragraph 0022. Proxy server connected to computer network. Paragraph 0026. Program code on memory in proxy server.),

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a server-logic module for fulfilling data requests via a first set of at least one communications protocols originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.),

wherein the data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0023. Proxy server is a buffer between client and Internet. Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Request with address of file sent to proxy server. Proxy server sends "send file" request to receive file from server.),

wherein the functionality of said data access engine related to said data request from said client-side data-processing machine is confined to data storage and retrieval (Paragraph 0024-0025. Server dedicated to storing files for loading. Remote server transfers file to proxy server.).

Vermeulen does not specifically teach wherein the at least one pseudo server communicates with the data access engine via a second set of at least one communications protocols; and

wherein said at least one pseudo server includes a user interface (UI) for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine.

O'Laughlen teaches a one pseudo server fulfilling data requests via a first set of at least one communications protocols originating from a client and communicating with a data access engine via a second set of at least one communications protocols (Paragraphs 0035-0036).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the one pseudo server of Vermeulen to fulfill data requests via a first set of at least one communications protocols originating from a client and communicate with the data access engine via a second set of at least one communications protocols as disclosed by O' Laughlen. One of

skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as O'Laughlen would have provided the benefit of supporting different types of protocols to communicate with clients and not be limited to standard protocols.

Mowat teaches a pseudo server that includes a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the pseudo server of Vermeulen to include a UI for fulfilling queries of requests originating from a client memory of a client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of enabling simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art. KSR, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d at 1395; Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273, 282, 189 USPQ 449, 453 (1976); Anderson 's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57, 62-63, 163 USPQ 673, 675 (1969); Great Atlantic & P. Tea Co. v. Supermarket Equipment Corp., 340 U.S. 147, 152, 87 USPQ 303, 306 (1950).

As per claim 43, Vermeulen, O'Laughlen, and Mowat teach the system of claim 42. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is located in a first network and at least one of said at least one pseudo one server is located in a second network having said client-side data-processing machine (Fig. 1; Paragraphs 0022-0023. Proxy server connected Intranet. Remote server connected to Internet.).

As per claim 47, Vermeulen, O'Laughlen, and Mowat teach the system of claim 42. Vermeulen teaches wherein a local data request from said client-side data-processing machine for data stored in one of said at least one pseudo server can be fulfilled directly by said one of said at least one pseudo server (Paragraph 0022, 0024. Proxy server determines file is in cache and transfer file.).

As per claim 48, Vermeulen, O'Laughlen, and Mowat teach the system of claim 42. Vermeulen teaches wherein said server-logic module is for fulfilling logic requests (Paragraphs 0022, 0024. Proxy server handles requests from client.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach said user interface of each of said at least one pseudo servers further are for user interface requests originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine.

Mowat teaches of a pseudo server having a UI for fulfilling user interface requests originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine (col. 5, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include in the pseudo server of Vermeulen a UI for fulfilling user interface requests originating from said client memory of said client-side data-processing machine as disclosed by Mowat. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Mowat would have similarly provided the benefit of enabling simple and extensible control of the pseudo server. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings as all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of O'Laughlen, Mowat, and Benayoun.

As per claim 44, Vermeulen and Mowat teach the system of claim 43. Vermeulen teaches wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate with other client-side data-processing machines via a pseudo server (Paragraph 0023. Clients connected to proxy server.). Vermeulen does not specifically teach communicating via pseudo servers within said first network.

Benayoun teaches communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers within said first network (Fig. 2; Paragraph 0064).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include communicating with other client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers within said first network as disclosed by Benayoun. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Benayoun would have provided the benefit of load sharing and robustness.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of O'Laughlen, Mowat, and Zellers.

As per claim 45, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the system of claim 42, wherein said data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server.

Zellers teaches a system comprising a data access engine and at least one pseudo server wherein the data-access engine is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and said at least one pseudo server (Figs. 2-3; Paragraphs 0039, 0043).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to include a content-filtering device and for the data-access engine to be configured to communicate via the content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine and



said at least one pseudo server as disclosed by Zellers. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have increased network security by controlling connections between networks.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen, in view of O'Laughlen, Mowat, and Cohen.

As per claim 46, Vermeulen does not specifically teach the system of claim 42, wherein said data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault.

Cohen teaches a data-access engine is configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault (col. 13, lines 42-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the data-access engine to be configured to only fulfill said data requests according to restrictions set by a network vault as disclosed by Cohen. One of skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings as Zeller would have increased security by providing secure storage and transfer of data.

### **Conclusion**

Examiner has cited particular sections of the references that are applied to the claims. While the sections are cited for convenience and are representative of the teachings of the prior art, other sections of the references may be relevant and applicable to the claims. It is respectfully requested that Applicant fully consider the references in their entirety when responding to the Office action.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on 571 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Joshua Joo/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445